

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

001

**B R O W N R A Y S M A N**

BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER &amp; STEINER

DEC 09 2004

**FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

**From:** Robert M. Bauer, Esq.      **Date:** December 9, 2004  
**Direct Dial:** 212-895-2630      **Client/Matter #:** 6173-04US

**PLEASE DELIVER AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO:**

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Fax No.</b>	<b>Phone No.</b>
1. Marie C. Ubiles	USPTO/Group: 2642	(703) 872-9306	

Total number of pages including this page: 3

If you do not receive all the pages, please call 212-895-2984.

**Applicant(s):** Veli-Pekka Ketonen, et al.**Application No.:** 09/872,476**Filing Date:** June 1, 2001**Art Unit:** 2642**Examiner:** Marie C. Ubiles

**Title:** METHOD AND CIRCUITRY FOR HIGH POWER AMPLIFIERS WITH  
 VOLTAGE CONVERSION TO AVOID PERFORMANCE  
 DEGRADATION, SYSTEM SHUTDOWN AND PERMANENT  
 DAMAGE IN CASE OF WORST CASE DATA PATTERN

Please find enclosed: **RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

12/09/04 THU 16:07 FAX 2128952900

BRMF& S LLP

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

002

DEC 09 2004

Docket No. 6173-04US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Veli-Pekka Ketonen, et al.

Application No.: 09/872,476

Filing Date: June 1, 2001

Art Unit: 2642

Examiner: Marie C. Ubiles

Title: METHOD AND CIRCUITRY FOR HIGH POWER AMPLIFIERS  
WITH VOLTAGE CONVERSION TO AVOID PERFORMANCE  
DEGRADATION, SYSTEM SHUTDOWN AND PERMANENT  
DAMAGE IN CASE OF WORST CASE DATA PATTERN

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

December 9, 2004

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Office Action dated September 9, 2004. The Office Action rejected claims 1-5 and 11-15 as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0039888 to Hama, in combination with unspecified "well known" art. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that dependent claims 6-10 and 16-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Prior Art Rejection

Applicants respectfully traverse the prior art rejection on the grounds that the reference applied in the rejection is not prior art. U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

Docket No. 6173-04US

2002/0039888 to Hama is not prior art because it was not filed prior to the June 1, 2001 filing date of this application. Although Hama claims priority to a Japanese patent application filed before the June 1, 2001 filing date of this application, the foreign priority date of Hama cannot be used to antedate this application's filing date. MPEP 2136.03.

**Incomplete Office Action**

Applicants also respectfully submit that the Office Action does not include a proper notification under 35 U.S.C. 132. The grounds for the rejection are set forth in part 2 on pages 2-4 of the Office Action. The rejection acknowledges that Hama, the only reference identified in the rejection, does not include all of the limitations of the rejected claims and additionally relies upon other unspecified "well known" prior art.

A proper notification of a rejection includes "such information and references as may be useful in judging of the propriety of continuing the prosecution." See 35 U.S.C. 132. A mere allegation of other prior art is not sufficient to permit applicants to judge the propriety of the rejection and thus the Office Action does not include a complete and proper notification.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. Bauer, Registration No. 34,487  
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN  
FELDER & STEINER, LLP  
900 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
Tel.: 212-895-2000  
Fax.: 212-895-2900